

REMARKS

Applicant's representative expresses appreciation for the in person interview conducted on March 4. The amendments made by this response and the remarks are consistent with that which was discussed during the interview.

The Final Office Action, mailed December 10, 2008, considered claims 1-14 and 22-45. Claims 1, 4-5, 9-11, 27, 30-31, 35-37 and 41-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Moreh (6,959,336) and further in view of Sweet (2002/0031230) and Seamons (2002/0016777). Claims 2-3, 8, 12, 22, 25-26, 28-29, 34 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Moreh and further in view of Sweet, Seamons and Wood (6,609,198). Claims 7, 14, 33 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Moreh and in further view of Sweet, Seamons and Leah (6,986,039). Claims 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Moreh and further in view of Sweet, Seamons, Wood and Leah. Claims 13 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Moreh and further in view of Sweet Seamons, Wood and Laursen (6,065,120). Claims 6 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Moreh and further in view of Sweet Seamons and Laursen.

By this response, claims 1, 3-9, 22-24, 27, 29-36, 41, 43, and 45 are amended, claims 10-14, 26, 36-40, and 42 are canceled, and claims 46-50 are added¹. Claims 1-9, 22-25, 27-35, 41, and 43-50 remain pending of which claims 1, 27, and 48 are independent.

The independent claims have been amended to clarify that a single user may use multiple distinct sets of login credentials to access the same account. For example, a user may have an online email account that he wishes to access not only from his computer, but from his phone. In prior art approaches, to login to the account, the user would typically be required to provide a username (e.g. abc@xyz.com) and a password. Doing so is simple from a computer. However, entering the letters and special characters from a typical cell phone is quite difficult and time consuming. Therefore, the present invention allows a single user to use separate login credentials from his phone to login to the same email account. These separate login credentials could be a phone number and a numeric pin which would be much easier to enter on a phone.

¹ Claims 46 and 47 each contain limitations that previously appeared in independent claims 1 and 27. Each of the amendments is supported by the entire specification which discloses the multiple login credentials for a single user idea.

The amendments clarify these aspects. For example, the claims have been amended to recite that different sets of credentials are used to clarify that the user is not simply providing an additional credential (such as a challenge question, or a certificate) in addition to the typical username and password. To further emphasize this, the claims have been amended to state that the numeric username of the second set of credentials is distinct from the username of the first set. The claims have also been amended to clarify that the user receives access to the same account regardless of the set of credentials used to login.

Although the cited art teaches various aspects of authentication, Applicant submits that none of the references teach or suggest that two different sets of criteria may be used to access the same account.

Moreh, the main reference cited as teaching this limitation, discloses “an authentication system which permits the use of multiple authentication *types* and multiple authentication *sources* from different domains of control.” Col. 2, lines 32-35. Types are defined as user id/password, biometrics, digital certificates, etc. Although this appears to be similar to the present invention, Moreh does not state or suggest that a single user could possess multiple different sets of credentials at the same time for accessing the same account. What Moreh does teach is that a user may select which type of authentication he would prefer to use to authenticate to a system regardless of the type of authentication that his co-workers are using. In other words, an administrator would be able to set up username/password login for one employee, and set up biometric login for another.

Although there are various sentences of Moreh that appear to suggest that a user could have multiple sets of credentials at the same time, the majority of the disclosure would suggest otherwise. For example, in the abstract, it states that “[w]hen multiple authentication mechanisms are available, an optional agent mechanisms resolution process and mechanisms repository...may be used to resolve to one suitable authentication mechanism.” If the user had multiple sets of credentials, there would be no need to resolve to one authentication mechanism because the user could input any of the sets that he has. To further illustrate this point, Moreh states that “[a] successful interaction between the client and the authentication agent produces information about exactly one authentication mechanism for the client to use.” Again this shows that the purpose of Moreh is to determine which single authentication type the user has selected for authentication when other users are allowed to use different authentication types. See Col. 10-11 describing fig. 2 (illustrating how the invention is used by a first company which uses one type of authentication to grant access to a second company which uses a

second type of authentication without having to set up a separate system to perform the second type of authentication). Finally, Moreh also states that its system “permits the use of multiple authentication types and multiple authentication sources from different domains of control, regardless of how disharmonious these may be....The ability to support multiple types of authentication permits organizations to deploy one authentication type and migrate to other types as desired, say, as their needs grow or as more robust types emerge. Col. 15, lines 45-56. In short, Moreh fails to teach or suggest that “the user may access the single unique user account by entering either the first set or the second set of credentials.” To interpret Moreh as teaching this requires hindsight analysis.

Sweet likewise fails to teach or suggest these limitations. Sweet teaches the provision of different levels of access to documents which is determined by a user's profile. For example, paragraph 29 states that members “authenticate themselves with the appropriate technology chosen by the organization” indicating that a single login is provided to each user. The strength of the login may be increased by requiring additional information for a single login such as a pin, token, and biometrics. *See ¶ 28.* However, in each case, the user has a single set of login credentials that are assigned by the organization and that are used to access an account.

Seamons discloses embodiments for performing trust negotiations. Credentials are exchanged to establish a trust. The examiner cited paragraph 32 as teaching the selection of credentials to be used to access a single service. The teachings of Seamons are very different from what is claimed because the present invention uses multiple sets of credentials to access the same account rather than different accounts as is done in Seamons. The teachings of Seamons would be similar to a user selecting his gmail credentials when accessing his gmail account and selecting his hotmail credentials when accessing his hotmail account.

The remaining references were cited as only teaching various features found only in the dependent claims and do not add to the teachings of Moreh, Sweet, and Seamons with regards to the limitations of the independent claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that the combination of these references fail to teach or suggest each limitation of the independent claims. In spite of this, the independent claims have been further amended to focus specifically on the situation where a user logs in to his account from a desktop computer using a username and password and also logs in to the same account from his cell phone using a numeric username and password. These limitations better clarify the scope of the invention and further distinguish the claims from the teachings of the cited art.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all the rejections to the independent claims are now moot and that the independent claims are now allowable over the cited art, such that any of the remaining rejections and assertions made, particularly with respect to all of the dependent claims, do not need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice, and particularly with regard to the dependent claims.²

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; and/or (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17; and/or (3) any post issuance fees under 37 CFR § 1.20. In addition, if any additional extension of time is required, which has not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefore and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Dated this 5th day of March, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Tucker

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:BT:gd
2242835_1

² Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting any official notice taken. Furthermore, although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.